



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

2

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/620,539	07/16/2003	Manfred Ostertag	14066-024001 / 2003P00076	8440
32864	7590	07/25/2006	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			LIN, WEN TAI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	

DATE MAILED: 07/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/620,539

Applicant(s)

OSTERTAG ET AL.

Examiner

Wen-Tai Lin

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-75 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-75 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20, 22-33, 35-46, 48-58, 60-70 and 72-75 are presented for examination.

2. In the remarks, Applicant argues that the finality of the previous office action is premature because of the introduction of new ground of rejections for claims 5, 18, 31, 44, 56 and 68 cited Olivier (a 102 reference), rather than Kanevsky (a 103 reference) that was cited in the previous non-final office action for the rejection of these claims.

Applicant is reminded that in the previous non-final office action the examiner raised an issue regarding the meaning of the term "enterprise resource planning system", wherein claims 5, 18, 31, 44, 56 and 68 were rejected over Kanevsky for the exact wording of this term. Since Applicant's follow-up remarks confirmed that the term does not relate to any proprietary system and could be broadly interpreted as any planning system, Kanevsky was no longer needed in the rejection of claims 5, 18, 31, 44, 56 and 68.

Nevertheless, the argument is moot because of the RCE and the instant office action being made non-final.

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, USC code not included in this action can be found in the prior Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. Claims 1-20, 22-33, 35-46, 48-58, 60-70 and 72-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Olivier [U.S. Pat. No. 6480885].

5. Olivier was cited in the last office action.

6. As to claim 1, Olivier teaches the invention as claimed including: a method of mining human capital information, the method comprising:

receiving user input specifying criteria of association with a dynamic target group by defining one or more attributes of a communication group [e.g., col.8 line 66 – col.9 line 13 and Fig. 4; i.e., defining neighborhood to each subscriber require dynamic target grouping];

identifying individuals of the dynamic target group by searching one or both of explicit and implicit data sources according to the defined attributes, wherein a scope of the search is without regard to an individual's membership to a defined group [col.6, lines 34-53; 258, 234, Figs.2 and 4; e.g., searching for "neighborhood" members to a participant requires the use of the participant's dynamically defined criteria such as distance and the search scope must cover the entire membership database because each member has his/her own definition of interested neighbors such as distance from the subscriber's home address];

communicating with identified individuals of the dynamic target group [e.g., 238, Fig.2];

logging at least some of the communications; and analyzing the logged communications [col.3, lines 23-32 and 57-60; Abstract, lines 15-17].

7. As to claim 2, Olivier further teaches saving the defined attributes [i.e., the attributes forming each group must be saved otherwise the match servers of Fig.7 would not know what to match].

8. As to claim 3, Olivier further teaches communicating with the identified individuals of the dynamic target group includes sending to the identified individuals of the dynamic target group an information request based on at least one of a survey and a questionnaire [e.g., in response to an email of Figs. 8-9].

9. As to claim 4, Olivier further teaches generating a report based on a result of analyzing the logged communications [e.g., col.3, lines 57-60; i.e., report on each subject as individualized archive].

10. As to claim 5, Olivier further teaches accessing an enterprise planning system to identify individuals of the dynamic target group [e.g., Figs. 2 and 3B, wherein Fig.2 illustrates a planning system that is carried out by a system resource of Fig.3B; see also

the interpretation of the term "enterprise resource planning system" in paragraph 2 of this office action].

11. As to claim 6, Olivier further teaches sending information to a member of the dynamic target group triggered on an occurrence of a life or work event associated with a member [see the example of Fig.8].

12. As to claim 7, Olivier further teaches defining attributes includes defining attributes based on at least one of special knowledge area, work experience, academic experience, position, and work situation associated with the dynamic target group [col.17, lines 7-14; col.18, lines 5-17].

13. As to claim 8, Olivier further teaches communicating occurs over at least one of a computer network, wireless, the Internet, an Intranet, electronic-mail and voice-mail [Abstract].

14. As to claim 9, Olivier further teaches communicating includes sending to the identified individuals of the dynamic target group at least one of structured communication [e.g., 524 of Fig.9 is structured communication] wherein possible responses to queries are predefined and unstructured communication wherein possible responses to queries are not predefined [i.e., by default reply to question at 526 of Fig.9 (after satisfying matching criteria) is unstructured and not predefined].

15. As to claim 10, Olivier further teaches that communicating includes distributing information to the identified individuals of the dynamic target group, and receiving feedback from the identified individuals of the dynamic target group [Abstract].

16. As to claim 11, Olivier further teaches providing an enterprise with an ability to make decisions based on a result of analyzing the one or more logged communications [col.3, lines 57-60; col.17, lines 21-27; i.e., filtering uncorrelated material (including spam) is a decision making process based on what's in the archive].

17. As to claim 12, Olivier further teaches that searching explicit data sources includes searching data sources having explicitly defined attribute information [e.g., col.9, lines 18-29; i.e., explicit data is entered as a user's profile through registration].

18. As to claim 13, Olivier further teaches that searching implicit data sources includes searching data sources having implicitly defined attribute information [e.g., col.16, lines 56-66; i.e., attributes specified in an email requiring additional processing are thus indirectly obtained].

19. As to claims 14-18, 19-20, 22-31, 32-33, 35-40, 44, 56 and 68, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1-5 and 6-13, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-5 and 6-13 above.

20. As to claim 41-42, Olivier further teaches generating and updating a distribution list of the target group at the time information is exchanged with the target group [e.g., col.25, lines 1-11; col.23, lines 26-50; i.e., in a chat or game setting, updating the list is inherently required because members come and go]

21. As to claims 43, 45-46, 48-55, 57-58, 60-67, 69-70 and 72-75, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 14, 23, 25-27, 29, 32-33, 35-36, 38-40 and 42, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 14, 23, 25-27, 29, 32-33, 35-36, 38-40 and 42 above.

22. Applicant's arguments filed on 6/2/2006 for claims 1-20, 22-33, 35-46, 48-58, 60-70 and 72-75 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Specifically, Applicant cited paragraphs 12 and 76 of the specification to argue that Olivier's membership or target group is drawn from a pre-existing mailing list, while Applicant's system allows searches to include cover the entire company's database by dynamically specifying search criteria.

23. The examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's remarks. In the example of Fig.4 and col.8 line 66 – col.9 line 13, Olivier also describes dynamically formed target groups called "neighborhood", which is impossible to be formed beforehand and fixed as mailing lists because each subscriber (which is equivalent to a company's employee

or a relevant database entry) can specify its own criteria such as distance-from-home at the time of requesting a mailing list (see Fig.9). The analogy between Olivier's subscriber database and Applicant's "enterprise resource planning system" is clear: they are both in a form of database with various attributes and can be updated any time that no fixed mailing list is meaningful.

For at least the above reasons, it is submitted that the prior art of record reads on the claims.

Conclusion

Examiner note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen-Tai Lin whose telephone number is (571)272-3969. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday(8:00-5:00).

Art Unit: 2154

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571)272-3964. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703)872-9306 for official communications; and

(571)273-3969 for status inquires draft communication.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Wen-Tai Lin

July 12, 2006

Wen-Tai Lin
7/12/06